

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on January 2, 2024 in Council Chambers, at 37 Green Street.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Douglas Proctor, Ron King, Zarron Simonis, and Claude Gentilhomme.

Absent: Alternate Member Amanda Savage

Staff: Alec Bass, Senior Planner  
AnneMarie Skinner, Assistant City Planner  
Krista Tremblay, Administrative Specialist  
Brian Tremblay, Code Inspector

### **Call to Order**

1. Co-Chair Hengen called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

2. On a motion made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Proctor, the committee voted to approve the minutes from the December 5, 2023 meeting. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Sign Applications**

3. Victoria Poland, on behalf of Stephen Duprey, requests ADR approval for a new 90 sf non-illuminated free-standing sign at the intersection of North State Street and Horseshoe Pond Lane in the Institutional (IS) District.

Victoria Poland represented the application.

Ms. Poland explained they are looking to get ADR approval for the sign that they had a variance for because it is an offsite sign. There is approved variance for November from the ZBA meeting. Looking to install the sign there because the Franklin Pierce Society is off the beaten path and there is no good frontage to bring in passer byers or tourists. Placing the sign in the requested location would allow people to know where it is, know that it exists and give direction to get to the location.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is pretty straight forward.

Mr. King asked if someone was to hang open\closed sign every day?

Ms. Poland stated yes, they will. They are waiting on license agreement. There is a good draft from the State and figuring out insurance for the sign.

Mr. King asked how much is Steve Duprey involved with this?

Ms. Poland stated he is donating the sign.

Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Simonis seconded.

Discussion.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Co-chair Doherty asked if it is two flat panels around a one-inch box? So, it is not three dimensional but just two panels?

Ms. Poland stated is it not three dimensional it is just a panel.

Mr. Proctor asked if a front and back are the same on both sides.

Ms. Poland stated yes. They will be identical.

Co-Chair Doherty asked is can make one thick panel?

Ms. Poland stated she is not sure.

Mr. Proctor wanted to know if they could add what year was he was president.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Signarama of Concord requests ADR approval for one (1) new 30.66 sf internally illuminated pylon sign, two (2) new 18.88 sf externally illuminated wall signs, and five (5) non-illuminated window signs of 0.44 sf, 4 sf, 0.5 sf, 0.5 sf and 2.25 sf at 249 Sheep Davis Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one present to represent this application.

Mr. Bass stated this is existing signage being permitted for compliance.

Mr. Tremblay stated Mr. Bass is correct.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is over zoning allowance or all within?

Mr. Tremblay stated this is all within.

Co- Chair Doherty noted the pylon sign has the phone number on it. He asked if they typically see that?

Co-Chair Hengen stated no and none of the other signs have them either. She noted they discourage phone numbers and websites.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to approve as submitted with the stipulation that the phone number be removed from pylon sign. Mr. King seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Harvey Signs, on behalf of Capital City Kia, requests ADR approval for a new 38.28 sf internally illuminated wall sign and a new 22.02 sf internally illuminated wall sign at 158 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) District.

No one is present for this application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated these look pretty slick to me. The black with the silver letters.

Co-Chair Hengen noted this is a re-branding of the font.

Mr. Proctor stated it is easier to read.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Bass noted there are three signs visible in the packet but only two of them qualify for ADR review based on their size.

Co-Chair made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. King seconded. No Discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Sign Source, on behalf of Craft Market, requests ADR approval for a new 31.2 sf internally illuminated and a new 14.7 sf internally illuminated pylon tenant panels at 75 Fort Eddy Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one present for this application.

Mr. Tremblay stated there is a pylon sign in the back of the building that was never noticed because it was covered with trees. When they did tree trimming they located the sign and wanted to have it installed.

Co-Chair Doherty thinks the recommendation for the building sign similar to this was to have an opaque panel behind the white. The question was the phoenix symbol and how they would do that and questioning if that is why they are coming back for review.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to approve as submitted with the stipulation an opaque background be placed behind the white or do a black background with white letters. Mr. King seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Lindsay Taylor, on behalf of Salon Lotus, requests ADR approval for a new 4 sf non-illuminated window sign at 57 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Mr. Bass stated item 7 has been pulled from agenda.

8. Julia Mehrmann, on behalf of Glow, requests ADR approval for a new 1.11 sf non-illuminated window sign and a new 6 sf internally illuminated window sign at 57 North Main Street (2 Capitol Plaza) in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the window sign is a rectangular sign that is hanging in the window?

Mr. Tremblay stated the sign is internally lit sign.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it is a sign that is hanging? It presents as painted on the glass.

Mr. Tremblay stated yes, correct it is hanging.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if only the glow is illuminated.

Mr. Tremblay stated yes.

Mr. Proctor asked if the door is in the alley way?

Mr. Tremblay stated yes. There is one facing School St and the other is in the alley way of Capital Plaza.

Mr. Simonis asked if there are two signs they are reviewing.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Tremblay stated yes, there are two signs they are reviewing.

Mr. Simonis can see the one in the window and asked where the other one is located.

Mr. Tremblay stated there is one in the entrance.

Mr. Simonis asked if these are both existing?

Mr. Tremblay stated they are both existing signs which were found to have been unpermitted.

Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Proctor seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Josh Philbrick, on behalf of Care Counseling Services, requests ADR approval for a new 15.96 sf externally illuminated wall sign at 47 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the lighting is not shown.

Mr. Tremblay stated the lighting is not shown, but there is existing lighting overhead.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if this sign is just the letters with no box around them?

Mr. Tremblay stated yes.

Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted. Co-Chair Doherty seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Mark Yusko, on behalf of The Bristol Watchmaker, requests ADR approval for a new 5.25 sf non-illuminated wall sign at 13 Pleasant Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one is present to represent this application.

Mr. King asked if this is an existing sign?

Mr. Tremblay stated it is an existing sign that was never permitted.

Co-Chair Hengen noted this sign has been up for many years.

Mr. Tremblay noted it has been up for thirty plus years.

Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted. Co-Chair Doherty seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Ron Dulong, on behalf of Brett Marshall, requests ADR approval for a new 9.5 sf non-illuminated window sign at 9 Pleasant Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if this has come before ADR previously?

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Tremblay stated no. This is another existing and did not have a permit.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Simonis seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**Conditional Use Permit Applications**

Mr. Gentilhomme arrived in the middle of agenda item 12 at 8:54 a.m.

12. Victoria Poland, on behalf of Stephen Duprey, requests ADR approval for a Conditional Use Permit to place a new 57.2 sf internally illuminated blade sign between rows of windows, above the top row of windows, or at a height in excess of 25 feet at 45 South Main Street, in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Victoria Poland represented this application.

Ms. Poland stated that the Concord Coach exhibit, which was conditionally approved on September 20, 2023, would block the existing Gibson's Bookstore signage. The proposed sign would alleviate the lack of visible signage. They want to please their tenants and help them succeed as much as they can.

Co-Chair Hengen asked how this is different from what they saw several months ago?

Ms. Poland stated this sign is different from what they saw several months ago because it is a little smaller. They are no longer going over the 150 square footage of signage that is allotted for the building. The color although it is a little off here because they will get actual sample of the building color. It will match the brick so it blends in better with the building and the other signs in the area. Also, the green and yellow match the colors on the existing building signs in the front now. It looks pretty much the same. She noted it is now a rectangle versus the previous submission which looked a little like a dog bone.

Mr. Proctor stated it is difficult to match a brick to a solid color, he suggested the color of the awning in front be used as the background color for this sign.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it would be a deep maroon color? Because the awning has more than one color.

Ms. Poland stated yes, it will be a deep maroon color.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is internally illuminated?

Ms. Poland stated yes.

Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted with stipulation the background color that currently shows as red on the application matches the dark maroon color of the awning. Mr. Simonis seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**Site Plan & Subdivision Applications**

13. Wilcox & Barton, Inc. on behalf of Steve Duprey, requests ADR approval as part of an amendment to a Major Site Plan approval to construct a 2-story commercial building rather than the previously-approved multi-story building at 20 1/2 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2022-47)

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen asked Mr. Bass about agenda item 13 and 14 in that they look so similar and wondered about the distinction between the two.

Ms. Skinner stated she can summarize. These are on two different pieces of property. The plans are similar because they submitted almost the same materials for both pieces of property. One piece of property has the proposed 2-story building that was previously approved as a 4-story building. The other piece of property has the Carriage House that they are renovating. However, both sets of plans submitted for both projects show all both the proposed 4-story building and the Carriage House..

Co-Chair Hengen asked if ADR will be reviewing these as two separate projects?

Mr. Bass stated yes. One is an amendment to a previously conditionally approved plan and it was determined that the newer addition [renovation of the Carriage House] is its own unique thing. It is essentially the same project but they are different application processes.

Mr. King requested an explanation for they change, since ADR previously spent a lot of time reviewing the four-story building and approving it. Now this project is completely different.

Adam Morrill (Procon) presented as the applicant and introduced Ronny Maurer (Terrain Planning & Design) and Jessica Jacobson (Wilcox & Barton, Inc.). Mr. Morrill stated this is his third or fourth time in front of ADR over the past year and a half. He stated they really appreciate the members taking the time to listen.. He noted that orking with Steve Duprey has been a very exciting endeavor for Procon and this team. One of the great things about Mr. Duprey is that he has a lot of vision. This project is in an interesting location being adjacent to the Bank of New Hampshire Stage. There is a lot of history at this site with the Norris Bakery and things dating back to the 1860's. Mr. Morrill stated the best way to describe this process has been that Mr. Duprey is trying to do the best use for his property. He stated Mr. Duprey has explored several different things. The first time they were at ADR they submitted a two-story building but during the meeting they presented instead a five-story building. Mr. Morrill stated Mr. Duprey has been working with the College of Law and other entities to find the best use for the building. . Mr. Morrill stated they are here today to present the best use as a two-story building with an event space on the second floor and arestaurant on the first floor, with and activated courtyard and entertainment and music revue in the rear. They previously presented to ADR the four-story building with office space and apartments. Those spaces sounded great on paper, but when it came down to it the entertainment venues seem to make the most sense. Mr. Duprey tried to work hard with the college to make things happen. As time has changed and progressed, so has this project. Mr. Morrill stated they are here at ADR again with what they believe will be built on the site.

Co-Chair Hengen asked when you say “with the college” she is not sure what Mr. Morrill is referring to.

Mr. Morrill stated this was a part of their prior applications. Mr. Duprey had been applying to build small apartment buildings to be leased to the law school as there was a shortage of housing, but that did not work for this site.

Mr. Morrill stated the application package was comprehensive. Both sites are really connected into each other. Essentially, they are viewed as one in their minds, but thatprior to this they had just been focusing on the front. As a result, the presentation might ebb and flow between the two sitesbut there is a separate package for the rear. (The rear will be referred to as “Dukes” or the “Carriage House.”) The rear building was built in the 1920s for James C. Norris who is the son of James Norris of Norris Bakery. Looking from South Main St along what is referred to as “Arts Alley” is the connection to

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

South Main St to the rear parcel, which is the stable building of the Carriage House. Adjacent to the north is the Bank of New Hampshire Stage with its large illuminated Concord sign and bright marquee. The Carriage House is on the rear parcel with the adjacent retaining wall. Adjacent to the Carriage House is a rear addition of a gymnasium built in the early 1900s and to the front is the green building. Mr. Duprey is looking for the best opportunity to move that building and Mr. Morrill is not sure of the latest status on that move.

Mr. King asked if the gym is attached to the Carriage House?

Mr. Morrill stated the gym is attached to the green building. There is a small concreted block connector and it is attached the front residence.

Mr. King asked if that addition would be torn down and removed as well?

Mr. Morrill stated yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if all that was to be left on the site is the Carriage House?

Mr. Morrill stated correct. He noted the Carriage House and the gymnasium.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are looking south.

Mr. Morrill stated we are looking south at the co-op in the background and looking to the east down the alley back at the Bank of New Hampshire Stage elevator addition. Mr. Morrill noted on the floor plan they are looking at an address adjustment as right now it is referred to as 22 South Main St. They want to change to 20 South Main St and have the other property as 22 South Main St. At the primary corner of Arts Alley and South Main St would be the primary entrance to the restaurant. Along the street façade, there would be large expanses of glass with proposed exterior seating. Although unsure of the status, Mr. Morrill stated The Friendly Toast is under an agreement to occupy the first floor once the building is built. Mr. Morrill stated most of the South Main St façade will be dedicated to The Friendly Toast as well as the Arts Alley façade. Mr. Morrill noted the kitchen most likely would be in the back corner and seating would be along the glass on the exterior. Mr. Morrill noted the setback from the front property line is 10 feet. They propose adding exterior seating under the canopy for street presence during business hours. Along Arts Alley is the vestibule that would bring you to the second floor where there is a proposed event space. Further along the alley there is a large courtyard that is cradled on two sides by the proposed building and the Carriage House. Mr. Morrill noted in previous applications Mr. Duprey has a restored classic diner car from the 1940s to place in the courtyard space. At the end of the courtyard what would have been the blank brick façade of the co-op will have this classic diner.

Mr. King asked if this would be an operating diner and if there will be food?

Mr. Morrill stated he would defer to Mr. Duprey who was not able to be present for today's meeting. Mr. Morrill does not think it would operate as a restaurant but it would be for small events. It would not be open on a daily basis with regular business hours, but would likely be used by reservation or a pop-up kitchen. Mr. Morrill stated above the lower seating level, the exterior dining for The Friendly Toast below, there is a second-floor terrace, which has two operable partitions designed as upward acting glass doors. That would be the exterior patio space for the 3,500-square foot event center on the second floor, which has its own small catering kitchen and bathrooms. The primary focus has been activating the alley and South Main St with visible use and spilling between the interior and the

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

exterior space using these terraces to pushing activity to the street side. On the roof, would be an extension of the event space with a larger exterior terrace with approximately 3,000 square feet. Part of that would be an Airstream trailer that Mr. Duprey has converted to a mobile food and bar opportunity. Mr. Morrill stated Mr. Duprey has thought of calling it something like the “Concord Surf and Bocce Club.”with the idea of this event space being a very unique, fun space.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the second floor and the roof are private event spaces?

Mr. Morrill stated yes.

Mr. King asked if there is any opportunity to cover that space?

Mr. Morrill stated off the elevator and stair vestibule there is a portion of covered space. Mr. Morrill noted Mr. Duprey might consider some small cabanas or other types of coverings, although that’s not part of the current plan

Mr. King asked if Mr. Duprey has considered a roof top garden?

Mr. Morrill stated he was not sure if that had been discussed, noting that it is an interesting idea The intent is to have some greenery, both real and artificial.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if that is brick at the store front level?

Mr. Morrill stated yes, the brick is on both the Arts Alley and South Main St elevations. There is a proposed corrugated metal panel in flat black wrapping the second floor. There is a wood band that encompasses the use of each interior space on the exterior. The restaurant space is brick on the store front, capped with a copper canopy to separate the restaurant space from the event space. The event space is then wrapped with wooden trim that follows from grade up along the roof line creating a small extension and a little bit of cover for the event space terrace. On the upper level there is a slimmer wood trim that separates the event space vestibule and entry from the rest of the building. There is a fiber cement panel with a reveal system at a 45-degree rotation. They are sort of diamond-shaped pieces. Mr. Morrill stated Mr. Duprey wants to include a large mural that relates to something historic in Concord. Mr. Morrill noted Mr. Duprey wants to recognize the Abbott Downing Carriage Company signage and have a muralist paint something on that façade. The idea is this canvas on this portion of the building could be interchangeable. For a few years it would be this mural until it fades. In several years Mr. Duprey could look to have another mural installed. At this time, it will be the Abbott Downing Carriage Company.

Mr. King asked about the black.

Mr. Morrill stated the black is a digital display board that will be facing the courtyard space. It is lower than the Carriage House roof. It would be a display for that courtyard space. This would be a reserved space to be used by attendees at an event The façade facing the co-op is six feet away from their façade, so they are limited to the number of openings allowed in that area. It is a corrugated metal panel section. As far as what you would see from a street level you really only get a glimpse of the upper section because they are so tight to the co-op.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the front elevation is flush with that of the co-op?

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Morrill noted that it is a couple feet behind the co-op and then the building steps back a little bit further. Mr. Morrill noted Mr. Duprey wanted to have the co-op signage visible so the building does set back a little. This façade and the co-op façade are within a couple feet of each other.

Mr. Simonis asked if there is going to be lighting at night?

Mr. Morrill stated there will be some lighting at night. They do have a photometrics page. The intent of the space is to be bright, vibrant, and speak to the uses.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the courtyard space and if it's only through private reservation or open for public use by anyone walking on Main St?

Mr. Morrill stated he is not 100% sure. Mr. Morrill expressed he wished Mr. Duprey was present at this meeting to discuss. Mr. Morrill thinks this courtyard space would be reserved by the diner use or Duke's. They would like keep it somewhat secure. When it is not occupied he does not want people coming back at 2 a.m. to do whatever.

Mr. King asked how will that be enacted?

Mr. Morrill stated there are some gate sections and fencing that is included as a part of the other separate application and includes an archway.

Mr. King wanted confirmation that the gate, fencing, and archways are not part of this application under discuss.

Mr. Morrill confirmed.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested focusing on the architecture of this front building.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the courtyard is part of this building?

Mr. Morrill stated it is part of this building, but did not name the building. He stated three quarters of this is on this property and maybe a quarter of it is part of the rear property. He said he can see this space being similar, noting that the space will not be associated with The Friendly Toast

Co-Chair Doherty asked if it would be a waiting area?

Mr. Morrill stated no, this would be a part of the diner and Dukes.

Mr. Simonis asked if there was going to be a gate from Main St to stop people from getting into the nice colorful alley way?

Mr. Morrill stated he will jump ahead to the next package to address that question.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the location of dumpsters and service areas.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Jessica Jacobson responded, stating that the gateway is stepped back down the alley way past The Friendly Toast door. In order to get to the courtyard, it is separate from The Friendly Toast and they could have to go through the archway gate. It is set back to make it clear that the front corner is for Friendly Toast. You would have to go back in and around to get to that courtyard. The archway is intentional to make that separation. Regarding the dumpster question, Mr. Duprey does have an agreement, with an adjacent parcel to use that parcel's existing dumpsters. These existing dumpsters are located in the parking area. Ms. Jacobson thinks it is the co-op parking lot. She is not sure if that is the co-op parcel or the parcel layout, but that is where the dumpsters are located and there is agreement to utilize those dumpsters for this property.

Mr. King stated at one point there was a proposed little common area from South State Street down through this alley with the stairway and the back wall. He asked what happened to that?

Ms. Jacobson stated that will be a part of the second application being the alley way parcel. She noted as you can see in the renderings there is the retaining wall that exists today. The western abutter would have a stair case that is secured so only their users could utilize to get down to the alley way location. Part of the proposal for the alley parcel is to have a stair case for the abutters that would be secured. Ms. Jacobson stated they would have a key or code entry to utilize those stairs.

Mr. King asked if there was someone at the one level could connect to the other level?

Ms. Jacobson stated the connectivity for that would not have due to the coded entry. They may have open for certain times of the day. She noted that was not discussed if that would be open. It was solely for the abutters use and benefit not for the uses on this parcel.

Mr. Morrill pointed out the archway. They are using etched laser cut panels. For the arch symbol they are using guitars keyed together.

Mr. King asked if this appear on the plan?

Mr. Morrill stated he believes it is on the civil plan.

Ms. Jacobson stated yes, it is on the civil plan. The civil plan will reflect this archway and fence location.

Mr. Proctor stated it looks like a tree.

Mr. King stated before it was a really nice, graceful, sort of flow back there and now it has this barrier.

Mr. Proctor stated they are creating something that is inviting and everyone wants to look at but you cannot access it. He understands it is private property.

Mr. Morrill stated the intent for this archway and these gates would pivot back on themselves so when it is open it is inviting.

Mr. Proctor asked how is the kitchen serviced?

Mr. Morrill stated between the co-op and 22 South Main Street there is a service alley. Most deliveries would happen on the sidewalk and come in through the side door.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Ms. Skinner noted a few items that came up during staff review. The first is the width of the alley and height of any arches or overhangs for emergency fire vehicle access. It doesn't appear that the arches or overhangs meet the code requirements for height. Also, the number of the required restrooms in the diner based on the seating available is two and it appears there is only one.

Mr. Morrill stated they had their development meeting in November. Since then they have added a bathroom that opens to the courtyard. The diner has a bathroom and there is access to another bathroom. He noted they will go through all of that as part of the technical review.

Mr. Simonis asked about mechanical screening?

Mr. Morrill pointed out area for mechanical screening. He noted the proposed materials as corrugated metal panel, fiber cement reveal, nichiha wood look, fiber cement would be the trim bands, aluminum composite material would be the awning for the Friendly Toast, glass railing system, brick and other accessories.

Co- Chair Hengen asked about the glass on the second level as well the railing system?

Mr. Morrill stated that portion has a parapet wall that extends about thirty inches high and on top of that would be a glass rail. He pointed out the black posts and the parapet.

Mr. King asked to go back to the original the very first of the elevation. He noted every vertical element , aside from the bylines, as being different.

Mr. Morrill stated there are a lot of elements.. They have tried to keep the materials types to a minimum, with the exception of the Friendly Toast portion having the brick. The balance of the building is fiber cement and corrugated metal panel with glass.

Mr. King pointed out nothing is lining up and it is confusing.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he is concerned with the architecture. There does not seem to be a rhythm or cohesiveness. There are six or more elements, include the glass framing, and within the glass framing there are two different patterns. He noted it is choppy. Mr. Gentilhomme stated he wants to see something cohesive. He stated the previous building that they finally presented to ADR was wonderful, explaining that it tied together and had traditional brick. Mr. Gentilhomme is concerned with all of the different materials breaking up the design so much that its not something that he would like to look at. Mr. Gentilhomme wants to see something more cohesive. He does not mind using wood finish or corrugated metal. He noted none of the materials are bad. There are just too many materials. Mr. Gentilhomme thought it would be great if they could be a little more consistent. He also pointed out there are different forms going on with the property. He does not feel it is coming together for him. He noted that the roof top is a great idea and more use could be obtained from the roof top if it was extended and covered.

Mr. Morrill stated that, while there are different materials and layers, looking at the elevations the intent has always been to align these store fronts so there is sense on where the structure happens. The scale of these components tie together. . He understands the concern with the materials. . They did try to use traditional components but also incorporated a little bit more play on these intended uses. Mr. Morrill described some traditional store fronts wherein a three-part building that has a penthouse you have the store front on the lower level, the mid portion of the building which traditionally would have

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

been brick and then the upper level you can see the metal panel. He stated they were trying to keep some of those things in mind and maybe it is a little too much.

Co-Chair Hengen agrees with Mr. Gentilhomme. She likes the approach. It makes sense to have the store front read separately from the upper floors. She suggested the one way they could tie it in with the rest of the streetscape is to repeat some of the materials. Perhaps all of the verticals end of being brick, so there is a little more relationship between the first floor and that upper floor. Again, introducing contemporary materials is great. It is a contemporary building and you want the best contemporary design you can get, but it is a little jumbled right now.

Co-Chair Doherty stated so you have the folded plane of the wood that wraps around and that is the big box. In that is this black piece that happens and then you shove The Friendly Toast into that as it's own little piece. He loves how the black wraps around and goes down the other side. Co-Chair Doherty asked if they looked at bringing that black around to the front side and bringing it down?

Mr. Morrill asked if referring to the left-hand side of this view?

Co-Chair Doherty stated yes.

Mr. Morrill stated they did look at in previous iterations and had the upper level entrance on that side. However, when consulting with The Friendly Toast it was important to them that they have their own language. So, carrying that upper level material down in front of their space where one of their entrances is to that sidewalk area is one of the things The Friendly Toast was trying to avoid.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the way that pops it feels like that is an element and the you have this green piece that's further back.

Mr. Morrill stated that could potentially be a way of trying to create more comprehensive collaboration between the space and the adjacent spaces.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if the canopy over The Friendly Toast is a copper canopy?

Mr. Morrill stated it is an ACM copper canopy.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if the copper canopy is related to The Friendly Toast?

Mr. Morrill stated no, it is not a branded element.

Mr. Proctor stated The Friendly Toast likes to have a lot of things going on within their space to attract people.

Mr. Morrill pointed out on the adjacent Bank of New Hampshire Stage they have the polished chrome.

Mr. King asked about the silver colored thing above the brown is that part of The Friendly Toast?

Mr. Morrill stated no.

Mr. King stated the sign is on that.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Morrill stated the sign is on the canopy, similar to Arno's laundry on South Main Street. That was one of the inspirations.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if that would require a code variance?

Mr. Tremblay stated that is something he will have to look into.

Mr. Morrill asked what portion that is for the size or the location?

Mr. Tremblay stated the location.

Mr. King asked what they would be looking at?

Mr. Tremblay answered the overhang.

Mr. Morrill asked if it is because of the projection to the property line?

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is above the level of the business. She noted there is a careful balance between designing exterior space for a particular business and likely the building will outlast any business.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he had that very thought. He asked to go back to the sign and it occurs to him he would like to see a sign more incorporated into the architecture.

Co-Chair Doherty disagrees with Mr. Gentilhomme a little bit. He stated with the airstream trailer and the diner car it is vintage and has vintage elements. He understands what he is saying.

Mr. Proctor asked for applicant to go back to the front elevation of Main St. He noted he likes this because it reminds him of a 1930s car dealership. He feels that is in keeping with downtown. Having all the different materials does not bother him at all because it's making your eye dance around and suggesting a building of activity. All of the different things happening on the façade are suggesting that activity. Whether it is appropriate for downtown he is not sure. He does not have a problem with it the way it is.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the thing with the sign here it is showing it is set within the sign band. In the rendering it pops up. It is a little bit unclear exactly what the scale is and how it's integrated into the building.

Mr. Morrill stated he is happy to discuss that here so they can move forward with fitting within the ordinance?

Co-Chair Hengen stated in general any building on Main Street would include building design accommodation for signs.

Mr. Morrill asked if this sign were on the corrugated section if that would fall within?

Co-Chair Hengen stated she would think so because you could read that corrugated section as being part of the store front space. She stated Code will need to weigh in on that. If your design made it look as the upper of the store front the relationship would make sense, but if it is popping up into the second story.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Proctor pointed out it is attached to the canopy that is servicing the lower floor.

Mr. Morrill stated visually that corrugated horizontal mounted panel is the event space parapet wall.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he feels if it is mounted on the parapet wall, and it seems to be compliant.

Co-Chair Doherty stated this is such a three-dimensional building when they are looking at it 3D. He feels like the element would die down after the pop-up.

Mr. Morrill stated that is a great suggestion.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he thinks it is sad that this has gone from a 5-story to a 4-story to a 3-story to a 2-story building. He thinks they have done a nice job trying to carry the essence of what ADR is talking about.

Mr. Morrill noted one of the important things for Mr. Duprey has been to try to make as many spaces as he can. Mr. Morrill stated Mr. Duprey wants to share these things with the City.

Mr. King stated when he first saw this he thought there was a pocket park back there and was excited at the thought of that. People wandering in and out would be neat. Now he is learning it will be closed off 80% of the time.

Mr. Morrill stated he would hope it would not be closed 80% of the time.

Mr. King pointed out it will only be used when that space is rented out,.

Mr. Proctor stated it would be nice if there was a food service back there. He feels you need something back there to draw people in or it will be a space with no activity.

Co-Chair Doherty what ADR charge is here today with this applicant?

Co-Chair Hengen stated the agenda states approval. She feels ADR has a lot of questions. There have been ideas thrown out.

Co-Chair Doherty stated overall he thinks the concept is really good. He would like to see something happen here. Co-Chair Doherty stated he feels they are pretty close. However, there are a couple things, personally that he feels, need to be tweaked.

Mr. Morrill thinks that bringing the black panel down so that it mirrors the other end makes a lot of sense, especially where that lower level projects forward.

Mr. Simonis thinks it will look nice if that left side was the same design. That would make The Friendly Toast pop even more.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if The Friendly Toast anticipate their store front opening up to the outdoor patio?

Mr. Morrill stated there is a door here and other location they would use.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Gentilhomme stated it might be a little more cohesive if that was a black framed store front.

Co-Chair Hengen is hearing a lot of enthusiasm for the overall concept. ADR would like to see this application again.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked Co-Chair Hengen about the materials and cohesiveness.

Mr. King suggested to also mention something about the use of the public space back there.

Mr. Morrill stated the alley is not a part of this application..

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the gate design is far enough along that ADR is commenting or is this a place holder?

Mr. Morrill stated it is a place holder. They will involve a specialty fabricator to go a little bit more in-depth with the detail.

Co-Chair Hengen stated they can provide some guiding thoughts.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the gate. He asked if roughly 4.5-5 feet tall?

Mr. Morrill stated it is about five feet tall.

Co-Chair Doherty pointed out that someone could pop over and someone could be hiding back there.

Mr. Morrill thinks there will be element of closed circuit tv or security in this space.

Mr. King stated everyday it could be open.

Mr. Morrill said right.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if they are looking to approve with conditions that they come back?

Co-Chair Hengen stated that is one thing they could do.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion that they approve the project as presented but that the applicant study the architecture of the building, looking at materials and design in an effort to create a more cohesive design and come back to ADR.

Ms. Skinner asked if that is before going to Planning Board?

Co-Chair Hengen stated it would go to Planning Board and if they agree, then return to ADR.

Mr. Bass stated what you are recommending is ADR approval with the condition that they return to ADR. That is essentially a courtesy for them to present the design changes because ADR approval would have been granted.

Co-Chair Hengen stated that is pre-mature.

Mr. King stated that did not sound good. The Planning Board could approve the whole thing.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Bass stated the Planning Board could do that anyway.

There was discussion on recommending approval with a condition to return or recommending that they simply return.

Mr. Gentilhomme withdrew his motion and instead moved to not approve the architecture as presented.

Mr. Gentilhomme added to the motion that come back after having studied the architecture of the building looking for materials and the goal of providing a more cohesive design to the building. That makes it a little bit open there. They know that ADR would like to re-study the architecture.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the minutes should reflect all of the discussion of the comments.

Mr. King stated a more cohesive visual backing.

Mr. Gentilhomme added to the motion to improve the incorporation of signage.

Mr. King asked about adding the gate?

Co-Chair Hengen did not feel the gate needed to be addressed at this time.

Mr. Morrill pointed out the gate is also on the other property.

Mr. Bass asked if that was a motion?

Mr. King seconded.

Discussion.

Co-Chair Doherty asked when they come back to have a diagram that explains this box has these materials and simplify to understand how they are thinking about how they are geometrically placed. It might simplify the continuity piece ADR is talking about.

Mr. Simonis asked about the lighting as well. He is aware it will be in the package. He asked if there was any lighting high on this building?

Mr. Morrill stated there will be accent lighting on the railing about 18 inches above the terrace. There will not be cast lighting.

Co-Chair Hengen stated when they return ADR will need a full understanding of the lighting plan. She stated there is a motion and a second is there any further discussion? All in favor. Mr. Proctor is opposed. 5-1

14. Wilcox & Barton, Inc, on behalf of Steve Duprey, requests ADR approval as part of a building permit application for a 2-story commercial building and an additional separate building at 22 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2023-146)

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Morrill presented this application. This is the rear parcel and they are referring to this as Dukes the Carriage House or 20 S Main Street. It includes Arts Alleyway, a portion of the courtyard space and the existing 2-story stable house\carriage house that was building in the early 1900s. On the first floor of this space there is existing overhead upward acting door and single door. Their intent is to replace those with more modern metal doors for light. Similar to the event space on South Main Street this would include a glass upward acting door for natural lighting in connection to the access to the alley way on the north side. Additionally, there is a secondary door that will feed to the courtyard space if there was event on the first floor there would be shared use of the courtyard space between the diner and the Dukes. There is another new entrance that feeds the courtyard. As far as the balance of the exterior and beyond that they are proposing including a canopy to replace those door elements and windows. The exterior design would also include painting the existing brick. At this point it is a little in disrepair. The brick will need thorough cleaning.

Mr. King asked what is going on with the top left corner.

Mr. Morrill stated the top left corner is the stairway and loading dock. The stairway is a benefit to the South State Street property on the uphill side of the retaining wall. It will provide access into the lower space. There will be some sort of mechanism to provide as this would not be open for anyone there will be a gate. People will not be able to cut through private property. There is an extension of the loading dock, which is currently a wooden small ramp, used to currently serve the Bank of New Hampshire Stage. This will be expansion of that with a proper built element. The intent is to make this not look like an industrial loading area. There is a colorful paint scheme there.

Mr. King asked about the Bank of New Hampshire Stage uses that loading platform now to get things in?

Mr. Morrill stated yes.

Mr. King stated the alley is really theirs as well.

Ms. Jacobson stated the loading dock is within an access easement.

Mr. King asked if they will need permission from them to open the gate?

Mr. Morrill stated he is sure there will be some sort of access agreement. If during off hours if there is a need to access maybe with a code or a key.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there will be a hand rail across that loading dock?

Mr. Morrill stated they do include a hand rail on the stair portion of that and that extends to the edge. The idea is that similar to most loading docks there is a railing with in the walk path. They will be within 30 inches of the 18-inch drop, so there is a continuous railing on that edge. However, the service portion of the loading dock would not intent because people would not use the loading doc.

Mr. Morrill stated the second floor will be similar to the first floor. There would be food and beverage opportunities, bathrooms, etc. They are proposing an elevator to provide accessible access from the first to the second floor. As far as egress is concerned they have the primary stair and that will drop of at the main entrance. There is a secondary egress stair that requires an easement from the adjacent property.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Simonis asked what is the intent for use of this space?

Mr. Morrill stated the intended use of this space would be an event venue focused on music and more lively type event space.

Mr. Simonis asked if this will be open to the public?

Mr. Morrill stated that is to be determined. He noted Mr. Duprey had discussed having a \$2 membership to join this food and dinner club. This way if there is issue with someone coming on the property they can say it is for members only. This way there is some level of control on who could potentially use this space.

Mr. Simonis asked about the gate and access to that area.

Mr. Morrill stated that the idea, as far as he is aware, is that this gate would be someone standing there and have to show ticket to get in. The idea is that they can close the space off when not open to the public.

Mr. King stated now he is confused. Previously Mr. Morrill stated it would be open for the public to come all the time. He noted now Mr. Morrill is saying it is closed off for events only. Mr. King asked who owns the property.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is private property. She noted she did not see any existing photographs of the existing building. She asked if they are using the existing openings and creating a few extras?

Mr. Morrill stated some of these photographs included as part of the site plan package.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about maintaining the existing recess size opening and arches when replacing the windows.

Mr. Morrill pointed out in this image you can see there is the arch for the upper level windows. These lower windows include a shallower arch.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about painting of the brick.

Mr. Morrill stated as they continue go through the package they will get to the painting of the brick. The Bank of New Hampshire Stage previously between 1860 and 1920 operated as the Norris Bakery. Mr. Duprey would like to have a historic mural painted on this brick of something to do with the Norris Bakery as they were the ones that owned the property between 1860 and 1920.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are talking about painting a mural and not the whole building?

Mr. Morrill stated they are going to paint the whole building. On the upper level when you see from South Main Street you can only see about half of the building. The grade drops as you go north. At this time, they are proposing kimono purple. Ultimately if it is approved to be painted a color Mr. Duprey will do a mock up on the building for before commencing painting on the entire building.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked about the brick that needs repairs and asked if that is why painting the entire building?

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Morrill stated it is a portion. You can see loose bricks, but structurally it is standing. There needs to be some maintenance.

Mr. Gentilhomme is asking if the reason for painting has nothing to do with the fact that the brick needs repair.

Mr. Morrill stated no. It is a preference. So, from this elevation you can see they have a propose signage at the corner of the building similar to the second floor.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if there will be rooftop equipment?

Mr. Morrill stated yes. There will be some small condensers.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated they will need to determine how they will shield that.

Mr. Morrill stated they will look at using equipment mounted screening. There will be a limited amount of roof top equipment.

Co-Chair Hengen asked for Mr. Morrill to circulate the paint sample.

Mr. Morrill said a part of this will be the alley way itself. He noted Mr. Duprey has the intent to hire a local muralist to paint the alley way. This will be designed by the muralist themselves. This would be interchangeable as it wears out. The intent is that this is something that reflects the nature of what is happening in this back space. The mural design will reflect music. The retaining wall itself would have a portion of the mural painted on it.

Mr. Simonis asked if the mural would be considered a sign?

Ms. Skinner stated that came up in the Staff review about mural verse signs. It was something Code was going to be investigating when they submit their permits for signs.

Mr. Bass asked if they are asking about the painting for the arts alley? He stated he feels like this would be apart of the ADR approval.

Co-Chair Doherty likes the concept it divides the area as a special place.

Co-Chair Hengen when get to sidewalk with the mural the design might create a flow where the artwork begins in the alley. On the color, she would prefer more of a deeper red or more towards a maroon.

Mr. Proctor and Mr. Simonis like the purple.

Mr. Gentilhomme is comfortable with it because it is set back from the street.

Co-Chair Doherty is not a huge fan of the color.

Mr. Proctor does wish the fence and the gate where a little more transparent.

Mr. Morrill stated this is a place holder and they will take that into consideration.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen stated in the motion they can clarify that the gate design needs to come back to ADR.

Mr. Gentilhomme noted it would be nice if the arch above the gate extended to the walls. It would independent and be transparent and disappear.

Mr. Proctor suggested to take the guitars and put on top of the arch.

Mr. Morrill pointed out designing archways is not something he has done regularly. Their intent was not to make it look like bars. They want a visual interest when open and closed.

Ms. Skinner asked what the clearance is for the archway?

Mr. Morrill stated currently it is around twelve feet but they can raise that to thirteen.

Ms. Skinner stated the Fire Marshall brought up how they are accommodating a fire truck to be able to get through that alley?

Mr. Morrill stated they can review that and increase that size.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if they will have a truck go up into that alley because when fighting a fire, they do not want to be too close to the building.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it sounded like the focus of the approval they give right now is to be on the building with the alleyway and the gate to be reviewed at another time.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he felt there were some good comment on the windows, murals and just the fence.

Mr. Simonis asked about the site package?

Mr. Bass stated due to file size he might not have that package.

Mr. Proctor asked about the two electrical poles.

Mr. Morrill stated they have been approved to be removed and have electrical underground.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the Dukes sign will come back to ADR for approval?

Mr. Bass stated they are in the Performance District and all the signs should come back unless you make a specific part of your motion to approve them.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to approve as submitted with the understanding that the sign will come back to ADR for approval, the gate\ fence will be resubmitted when the building comes back to ADR and the windows match, as discussed previously, historical depth and size to match existing windows.

Mr. Morrill asked about the windows and if should replicate the detailing within the archway and fill? He thinks there also is some vertical fanning.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen stated she does not have a great photo but usually there is brickmold on any window within a brick opening. That is a key architectural feature of the opening. To retain those and have the new window match the existing in terms of size. She feels it is a unique building downtown and the windows are a key part of its design. Co-Chair Hengen also pointed out there is a key feature in the fan light. She stated it has probably been there 70-80 years and would be part of the history of the building.

Mr. Morrill stated they would not propose a true divided light.

Co-Chair Hengen stated all of the wood molding would be a key feature to retain and then replace the sash.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if retain or replace if in the same form?

Co-Chair Hengen stated replace in kind.

Mr. Morrill asked if with wood?

Mr. Gentilhomme stated something that is going to replicate it and it could be aluminum. As long as it looks like it could have been original.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the key is that you have a profile within that window opening that needs to be retained. If you can do with aluminum that is fine.

Mr. Morrill stated he thinks the window themselves need to be replaced but they will see what they can do when trying to retain trim portion.

Mr. King see a lot of brick detail. He asked if they are ok with everything being painted.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the granite should not be painted.

Mr. Morrill stated just the brick. All the brick will be painted the uniform color. The granite will remain. The window would be a dark black.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he started a motion.

Co-Chair Hengen thinks the motion was to say that all of the alley artwork mural and gate would come back to ADR.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to approve as submitted with the understanding that the building will be painted and just the brick, the signs will come back with the sign application to ADR, the murals will come back to ADR with the design, the gate and the fencing will be a part of the other building application and ADR will consider that when they review that other piece, the windows to match detail discuss matching similar, Mr. Morrill pointed out the gate is on this property, and Co-Chair Doherty stated they are trying to approve one or can see whole thing. Mr. Morrill stated that works. Co-Chair Hengen the windows to retaining the wood molding or replicating to match. Mr. Bass the windows shall maintain and replicate? Co-Chair Hengen the sash, the arch in fill and the molding trim. Co-Chair Doherty the lighting to come back with the gate. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

15. Wilcox & Barton, Inc, on behalf of B&L Transmissions, LLC, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Site Plan approval for construction of a new automotive repair shop and related site improvements; and two Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) for separation of driveways and wetland buffer impacts at 388 Loudon Rd. in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2023-143)

This agenda item was postponed to February 6, 2024.

16. Calderwood Engineering, on behalf of Granite State Baptist Church, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Site Plan approval for construction of a new 2-story building to provide supplementary services to the church, including a gymnasium, classrooms (elementary through junior high), nursery, kitchen, and associated parking; and two Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) for shared parking and separation of driveways at 236 Sheep Davis Rd. in the Industrial (IN) District. (2023-142)

Pastor Peter Chamberland (owner), Mohamed Mohamud (Calderwood Engineering) and Brittany Weeks (Landscape Architect) represented this application.

Pastor Chamberland stated they are proposing an all-purpose building: gymnasium, classroom, nursery, kitchen and parking. They are about approximately 50 feet from their existing building. They are creating a new driveway with limited parking spots on the roadside. It will be one-story on the back 2/3 because of the gymnasium and on the front third it will be two-stories. There will be Sunday School classroom and youth group. There will be entryways on the south side of the building and it is designed that way because that is where their existing parking lot comes in. On the upper elevation for the new parking there will be entry way upstairs on the roadside on Sheep Davis Rd.

Mr. King asked if this is a school?

Pastor Chamberland stated no, not at this point. They do not have anything in the works to start a school. They are preparing if those days did come down the road that they would have facilities to take care of that. Right now, there is nothing in the works for that.

Mr. Mohamud stated the exterior of the building is pretty straight forward. As you can see the entrances in the middle as well as the two sides of the building.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked what are the exterior finishes.

Mr. Mohamud stated vertical siding, desert stone color.

Mr. Simonis asked if there was a photo metrics plan for this, his comment would be check because

Mr. Bass stated there was no lighting plan, or lights proposed on the civil plans but it was noticed by staff the lighting shown on building in the architectural plans. There is a Staff comment to provide a lighting plan for this.

Mr. King stated he does not see any walkways going between the entrances.

Mr. Mohamud noted the existing church is on the southern portion and there will be walkways from the existing side of the building with the ability to enter into the first floor at the gymnasium level and then also there is a driveway parking area that has pathways and access to the second floor of the building.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Simonis asked if this driveway is off the main road and if there will be signage?

Pastor Chamberland stated the new driveway is off of Sheep Davis Road. They are keeping their existing signage right now. At this time, they do not feel they need to relocate the existing sign. Eventually down the road they would because on the north end of this they might be able to build an auditorium for the church.

Mr. Simonis asked if it would be worth it to add a sign stating this is an auxiliary building?

Pastor Chamberland stated they might put something temporary saying like “watch us grow”. The biggest thing is to get laid out and get best placement for that sign and that is something they would consider.

Mr. Simonis asked do they need a building number for 911?

Pastor Chamberland answered the number they have been told by staff would be 238 Sheep Davis Rd.

Mr. King asked for the new parking lot if there is a way for them to get down to the new building. If overflow parking for the church was necessary would they have to go through this building? Pastor Chamberland stated they will have to go thru the building. They may come back and see how this lays out to add a stairwell between the building. Eventually, most things will move over to the new building and the existing church will be supplemental.

Mr. Proctor stated that the North-South designations on the architectural elevations are mislabeled.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to approve as submitted with the recommendation a walkway be provided between the parking lots. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

17. Altus Engineering, on behalf of Ryan Taber, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Subdivision approval for a 9-unit residential condominium development at 15 Hot Hole Pond Road in the Open Space Residential (RO) District. (2023-140)

Ryan Taber (owner) represented this application.

Mr. Bass stated the Applicant did provide resubmissions on Friday, December 29, 2023 for ADR items based on comments made at the last meeting. Staff was not able to get them on the agenda for this meeting.

Mr. Taber stated he went thru December meeting minutes and comments and tried to address all of the committees concerns; driveway changes, orientation of the houses, the building envelope areas, houses will fit in the areas. He stated lots 4-7 could increase their size from 45’ by 55’ to 45’ by 65’ and that is to accommodate a colonial style house such as the first one on the list. The garage orientation is facing street and it will be recessed. Everything falls under what was discussed at the last meeting. It falls in line with what is in the neighborhood. It is a 2-story building with attached garage with garage underneath, vinyl siding, vinyl windows, asphalt singles or metal roof, recessed garage, and focal point will be the front door. Elevations will be determined in the field based on existing conditions. There will be no lighting on the private drive. There will be no sidewalk. There will be a sign at the end of the road but not for the association. Trash removal will be included. All units will need a building permit.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. King is a little confused it appears all the units are the same size. When you flip to the narrow end facing the street he cannot see how the garage works. Unit 4, as an example may work, but unit 5 doesn't appear as though it would work with a garage. Where would the garage be and how would the driveway access it?

Mr. Taber responded for units 4-7 these layouts are going to change they will increase in size to accommodate those units. It is not depicted on the presentation because he is not doing any more engineering revisions until he goes thru Planning Board.

Mr. King asked if unit 5 could be orientated the other way?

Mr. Taber stated yes. Once go thru Planning Board for other revisions that is when this will be addressed.

Co-Chair Hengen stated their primary concerns the last time in terms of orientation and design that there always be the primary front entrance facing the street that if the garages are also street facing they be recessed. That there be a continuous set back. She felt looking at the site plan that has been achieved.

Mr. Taber stated that is listed on the site plan and also in the list.

Co-Chair Hengen noted also that there is an assurance these building plans would actually fit on the specific lots. She feels that will be resolved in the field with engineering.

Mr. Taber stated it is also listed.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the minimum 12 foot and wanted to know if that should be maximum?

Mr. Taber stated you can change that to maximum.

Co-Chair Hengen vinyl siding or hardy blank and asphalt or metal roof. Number 3, 2-story building with 2 car attached garage. She noted the recess of the garage was discussed in a different location.

Mr. Taber pointed out is lower down on the list.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if it has to be vinyl windows?

Mr. Taber stated vinyl is standard now.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about fiberglass windows.

Mr. Taber stated you do fiber glass for a sliding door. He can update that to vinyl or fiberglass. None of the plans show a walk-out basement that will be up to the buyer to determine if that is what they want to do. Window requirements can be adjusted to include vinyl or fiberglass with other restrictions removed. Mr. Taber will work with staff on this adjustment and does not need to return to ADR.

Mr. King stated that implies here that garages are to be recessed 2 feet if applicable. So, there could be some place where you want it flush. Where it is saying no.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Taber stated he can add in language that says that it can be flush. He stated that can be put into the association documents.

Mr. King noted it is saying if the garage is going to be on the front it needs to be recessed 2 feet.

Mr. Taber stated yes.

Mr. Proctor stated he has driven around Concord the last month and looked at a newer house that would fit on these lots and the garage is proud by 2 feet and it is still a good-looking home.

Mr. Gentilhomme thinks to back off on the recess. He does not feel it is something that he needs.

Mr. King noted the whole idea is that the car is diminished in portion to and the relationship to the house.

Mr. Proctor stated in these lots half the front of the lot is the driveway that goes to the house.

Mr. Gentilhomme noted the fact is that we drive cars and does not want to see open garage

Co-Chair Hengen the bigger issue is that the garage not be forward of the front entrance.

Mr. Proctor stated to say it is not forward of the front of the building more than 4-5 feet.

Co-Chair Hengen pointed out this was discussed at the last month meeting in great detail.

Mr. Proctor stated since then he has driven around town and see homes that will fit on this lot.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated the primary thing you need is a front entrance that is clearly visible and architecture that is attractive.

Co-Chair Doherty stated they are trying to create a neighborhood so part of the neighborhood has a welcoming entrance. He stated they do not have designs they are looking at they just have rules.

Mr. Taber asked if they want to have it noted as having the garage doors even with the front of the house or recess. You can try to keep recessed as applicable.

Co-Chair Hengen stated number 7 could be street facing and either flush or recess. He can work with staff to make those changes to this language and does not need to come back to ADR for that.

Mr. Taber asked if he can strike number 2?

Co-Chair Hengen stated yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked ADR members if whether or not this list reflects the concerns they expressed last month?

Mr. Taber stated he will add another item that houses will face the street. He will have all houses front door will be facing the street. This can be added and work with staff to make the revisions without returning to ADR.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion that ADR recommend approval for this project as submitted with the understanding that the conditions that they laid out in previous meeting have been satisfied and that garages can be flush to the building, but always the front entrance be the primary design feature, and other changes discussed to be resolved with staff. Mr. King seconded. No discussion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**Other Business**

18. Concord Hotel Lighting

Jamie Simchik represented this item.

Mr. Simchik discussed his understanding was that this was a six-month trial and there is concern the blue was too bright and other colors were too muted at 20%. He is not sure if that is correct and happy to work with any and all concerned.

Co-Chair Hengen asked for Mr. Bass to remind ADR of what a six-month trial period encompasses.

Mr. Bass pulled up the April 20, 2022 Planning Board minutes for the Committee to reference.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they have been seeing the lighting at 20%?

Mr. Simchik answered it has been at 20%. He thinks intensities may have to do with RGB values, which have remained consistent.

Co-Chair Hengen stated one thing they talked about a couple months ago was to evaluate adjustments over a period of several nights so they can see it, instead of abstractly discuss numbers.

Mr. Simchik agreed that at this time of year it is darker earlier making that option more conducive. He stated based on feedback they can come up with a strategy to implement this type of review and different lighting intensities or colors.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the ADR Committee needs to weigh how any proposed lighting fits into the design guidelines for Main Street.

Mr. Simchik asked if there is concerns now which have deviated from what was approved?

Co-Chair Hengen stated they are a pilot case.

Mr. King stated he feels it is too bright and too prominent in the sky line.

Co-Chair Hengen would also like to discuss other colors including white.

Mr. Simchik stated they have not really scratched the surface as to what they can do with it. He asked to clarify if they want to use white or not use white?

Co-Chair Hengen stated white is a more traditional color to use for up lighting a cornice or a very subtle call to an architectural feature. There is a line between being a subtle and livening, or being a “look at me” kind of response. When you read the design guidelines what is the purpose of this

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 2, 2024 Minutes**

lighting? Is it to enhance the street scape or is it speaking to the highway? That is part of the discussion about what do we want for this to achieve and is it doing that?

Mr. Simchik stated the original scheme they proposed and received approval for was largely based on weather. When there were no events for special lighting they were worried it would be the same thing. The cornice is gray. They have had to tweak the colors not the intensity. It is the weather conditions. Blue and variations of red.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the blue she typically sees on the building would fall into the darker color category or not?

Mr. Simchik thinks blue is the brightest light.

Mr. Gentilhomme noticed recently he has come across the bridge and the look at the pharmacy Christmas decorations on the second floor versus the blue and the way it hits his eye it is as if it is glowing.

Mr. Simonis stated your eye does not react the same to blue as with other lights.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if blue light presents itself brighter.

Co-Chair Hengen stated their default seems to be blue and she asked why?

Mr. Simchik stated it is based on the weather. Steady blue is clear view, the blue with dashes is clouds, solid red is storms and dashing red is the snow.

Co-Chair Doherty stated if they are off it looks like they are broken

Mr. Simchik responded that they have heard that before.

Co-Chair Hengen sees two purposes of having the cornice lit. One is to draw attention the building. The other is to create interest that fits into the over all lighting and design scheme of Main Street for the pleasure of people using Main Street. She asked how would you express your purpose in the lighting?

Mr. Simchik does not feel they came up with the idea solely on their own, he believed some recommendations came from the City at the time. Initially, this was a brand-new hotel. The idea was events. He conceded that times are different 5 years from then, motivations of the City and their own could be different. They are happy to work with ADR, however they do not want to see their investment go to waste.

Co-Chair Hengen feels the hotel sign works well. The sign gives terms of here we are. The lighting is sort of additional enhancement for Main Street.

Mr. King wanted to go back to original his statement about how the lighting issue enhances the building and not be an attraction in and of itself. To him that means subtle.

Co-Chair Hengen stated that is what the design guidelines say and thinks they provide guideline for all of us.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 2, 2024 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen suggested Mr. Simchik look at the guidelines and working with those come up with a proposal with how he would like to handle the cornice lighting. Then outline a schedule that allows ADR to see suggestions whether it be color intensity so not just reading words on a paper. That they all have a chance to see in the field for further review.

Mr. Simchik asked if the proposal is to come next month and then do trial.

Mr. Simonis pointed out the reason the 20% was set was because the lights started flickering when they were set too low. They cannot go any lower than the 20%.

Mr. Simchik stated they maybe be able to look at darker color.

Mr. King would rather see a proposal after he sees what his limitations are and then see the trial.

Co-Chair Hengen said to come next month with the proposal and then start the trial.

Mr. Simchik stated he is fine to do that.

Mr. Simonis suggested they consider to turn off lights at certain times because there is no one on Main Street past 9 p.m. He suggested to shut off at 10 p.m. and turn on 4 a.m. Exceptions can be made for events.

Co-Chair Hengen Left the meeting at 11:37 a.m.

**Adjournment**

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Simonis to adjourn the meeting at 11:42 a.m. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,  
Krista Tremblay

**The next meeting will be held on February 6, 2024**